

**JANUARY 29, 1998
MEETING SUMMARY**

Draft
BDAC MEETING SUMMARY
JANUARY 29, 1998
SACRAMENTO CONVENTION CENTER
9:00 AM to 5:30 PM

MEETING OUTCOMES

The majority of BDAC members weighed in on several significant issues. They acknowledged that linking program elements, such as construction of storage facilities and finance and water use efficiency actions, was critical for increasing trust in the CALFED process. They also suggested that additional discussion and analysis of 1) agriculture land retirement issues, 2) how to effectively reduce effects of water diversions on delta fish species, and 3) how to effectively deal with high bromide concentrations in Delta water supplies, was needed in the near future.

1. WELCOME AND CHAIR'S REPORT (Mike Madigan)

Chair Mike Madigan convened the meeting of the Bay-Delta Advisory Council (BDAC) at 9:10 AM. He reviewed the agenda and the purpose of the meeting as announced in the BDAC meeting packet. The Chair noted that the topic under the Chair's report to discuss Westlands Water District water supply data would be put over to the March, 1998 BDAC meeting due to the absence of Roger Patterson of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau) at this BDAC meeting.

BDAC members were reminded that the dates of the March meeting are the 19th and 20th in Burbank.

Chair Madigan directed BDAC's attention to the draft Watershed Management Strategy. Copies of the Strategy were available at the BDAC meeting. Lester Snow (CALFED Program Executive Director) provided a brief overview of the Strategy noting that the geographic emphasis is on upper watersheds. He added that CALFED will use the draft Strategy as a basis for discussion with stakeholders and will conduct independent scientific peer review of the Strategy prior to its finalization.

Vice Chair Sunne McPeak requested that staff hold discussions on the Watershed Management Strategy with the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group (ERWG), the California Association of Counties, and the Regional Council of Rural Counties. Lester Snow agreed that such meetings should occur and added that it will be challenging to coordinate policy discussions due to the many potentially interested parties.

BDAC member Alex Hildebrand commented that weaknesses of the Strategy include lack of exotic species management, lack of discussion of an equitable balance with other actions of the CALFED program, and lack of discussion on re-use of water supply.

2. STATUS OF EIR/EIS (Lester Snow)

Presentation

Lester Snow reviewed the schedule, included in the BDAC packet, for release and public review of the draft programmatic Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). The document will consist of several volumes, including the main EIR/EIS, approximately 20 appendices, and the Phase II Report. He informed BDAC that the CALFED Policy Group, at its December meeting, decided to publish the draft EIR/EIS prior to the selection of a preferred alternative. Lester Snow reviewed the outline of the Phase II Report.

Discussion Points

BDAC members Robert Meacher and Martha Davis expressed concern that the timetable for public review of the EIR/EIS was inadequate and did not allow time for a feedback process to craft revisions for the final EIR/EIS. Lester Snow noted that CALFED would be conducting extensive outreach and would work with the Regional Council of Rural Counties to ensure input from those stakeholders.

- BDAC member Ann Notthoff commented that the Phase II Report may demystify the work of CALFED and provide analysis of the linkages between components of the program.
- BDAC member Roger Fontes commented that the CALFED decision will likely have significant impacts on hydroelectric power production in the state and that these impacts should be adequately characterized in the EIR/EIS. He noted that CALFED staff may be wrongly assuming that these impacts will be resolved as a result of the restructuring of the electric utility industry that is presently in progress. He requested that this be a topic for BDAC discussion at the March meeting. Lester Snow stated that the impacts to hydroelectric production need to be accurately documented. He noted that others have raised concerns about the ability of the market to bear additional costs of producing hydroelectricity. He noted that the Western Area Power Administration was part of the consortium of federal agencies participating in CALFED.

BDAC member Tom Graff raised concern about recent correspondence from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) concerning the schedule for water rights hearings to implement water quality standards authorized by the Bay-Delta Accord. Mr. Graff, Vice Chair McPeak, BDAC members Byron Buck, Hap Dunning, Stu Pyle, and Mike Stearns discussed with Lester Snow the possibility of a relationship between the schedule for the EIR/EIS and the water rights hearings. Some expressed the view that the SWRCB's proposed delay in the hearings would deprive CALFED of important baseline information at a critical point in the process of selecting a preferred alternative. Lester Snow stated that the water rights hearings will not affect the basic components of a future solution and nor will they directly affect the concerns that CALFED is addressing. Others felt that while this was an important topic and should be

scheduled for discussion at the next BDAC meeting, it was an unscheduled topic for today's meeting and therefore should not be discussed. Chair Madigan stated that it was his prerogative to determine what, if any, topics in addition to those on the agenda could be discussed at a BDAC meeting. He noted that the CALFED process is enhanced by discussion of topics of concern to BDAC members.

Later in the morning, Walt Pettit, Executive Director for the State Water Resources Control Board, addressed BDAC on this topic. Chair Madigan stated that BDAC would not be providing a recommendation on this topic during the meeting as it was not an item on the agenda. Mr. Pettit explained that a revision in the schedule for the hearings was being contemplated to accommodate ongoing negotiations among several entities who will be party to the hearings. These negotiations could result in agreements that would then be used as evidence in the hearings. The agreements could provide part of the solution for allocating responsibility for implementing the 1995 interim Bay-Delta water quality standards. He noted that the agreements, if successful, have the potential to reduce the scope of controversial issues that would be the subject of the hearings.

Mr. Pettit stated that the SWRCB has announced it will hold a workshop in mid-April on the status of the agreements. Following the workshop, the Board will determine whether or not the water rights hearings should be revised to incorporate the outcomes of the negotiations. He added that as a condition on the extension of the hearing process, the Board is requiring agreement from the state and federal water system operators to meet the interim standards throughout the entire hearings process. He noted that a trade-off exists between maintaining the present hearings schedule with the December, 1998 deadline or extending the hearing process to accommodate consideration of the agreements, thereby reducing the areas of potential conflict when the hearings are held. He noted that if the CALFED solution requires new water quality standards, the Board would then hold another round of hearings to allocate responsibility for those standards.

- Mr. Hildebrand asked about the probability of success for the potential agreements. Mr. Pettit replied that historically the success rate has been poor, however the chance for success should not be dismissed at the present time.
- Mr. Dunning asked about the implications for other SWRCB responsibilities, for example determining releases from Friant Dam to meet flood control releases and the Triennial Review of water quality standards. Mr. Pettit replied that the Board may proceed with the Triennial Review. He added that, unless an agreement is reached that can be entered as evidence in the hearings, the standards for the San Joaquin River at Vernalis may also be re-opened. He noted that the potential agreements are one of several pieces of evidence in future water rights hearings and that other factors such as reasonableness and the public trust doctrine would be considered as well.

- Mr. Graff read from correspondence from the Director of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Regional Administrator of the Bureau to the SWRCB which stated that the agencies are committed to operating the projects in accordance with the extension of the Bay-Delta Accord through December, 1998. The agencies would consider continuing operations to meet the standards beyond that date if necessary, but believed that the hearings process should be completed by December. Mr. Graff also referred to correspondence from Mr. Pettit to the agencies acknowledging that continuation of operations to meet the interim standards beyond 1998 would allow the Board to restructure the hearing process. Mr. Graff asked Mr. Pettit if the agencies had agreed to abide by the standards through the summer of 1999, the projected conclusion for the revised hearings process. Mr. Pettit replied that DWR has agreed to do so and no decision had yet been made by Bureau. He added that the SWRCB letter to the Bureau and DWR explicitly set forth the condition that the agencies must uphold the interim water quality standards in order for the Board to grant extension of the hearing process.
- BDAC member Roger Strelow asked what CALFED and BDAC could do to assist the SWRCB's process. Mr. Pettit responded that support for outreach efforts by CALFED and continuation of the CALFED planing process in a timely manner would help. He commented that the CALFED process is the only alternative to protracted litigation.
- Vice Chair McPeak stated that this was important to BDAC because some parties believe that previous agreements are being ignored which fuels distrust of the CALFED process. She recommended that the agencies adhere to the interim standards beyond December, 1998.
- BDAC member Ann Notthoff supported the view that the SWRCB is responsible for ensuring that the standards are met. She added that the hearings will provide critical information that can be used in the CALFED process. Mr. Pettit concurred that the Board is responsible for the interim standards. He added that prior to the end of the year the Board will have to revisit the temporary order of joint use of the two points of diversion in the South Delta.
- Mr. Graff remarked whether the contractors to the state and federal water projects were comfortable with meeting the obligations for the interim standards for an indefinite time while other water users were not so obligated. Mr. Pettit stated that the hearings extension would have a deadline that is now unspecified. Meeting the December, 1998 deadline would have been very difficult under any circumstances. He stated that within a few months it will become clear whether the agreements will be worthy of consideration in the water rights hearings or whether the hearings process will proceed without such agreements.

Chair Madigan stated that the status of the water rights hearings would be on the March BDAC agenda.

Public Comment

- Gary Bobker (The Bay Institute) handed out copies of a letter directed to the Executive Director of the SWRCB. He explained that there is controversy over how responsibility for implementing the water quality standards will be allocated. The SWRCB's decision will affect individual water users baseline and the baseline for the environment. He noted that a delay in the water rights hearings adds to existing concerns about whether the Bay-Delta Accord is being implemented as anticipated. The proposed delay also contributes to concern whether CALFED can assure that the programmatic decision will be implemented as agreed.

**3. CALFED RESOURCE/WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (Lester Snow, Dick Daniel)
Presentation**

Lester Snow explained that it was appropriate to review time value of water, a basic Program concept, as the Program prepares to select a preferred alternative. There is tremendous variability in Delta outflow, from year-to-year and during each year. Concurrently, there is high variability in the value of water for various purposes. He added that shifting the timing and patterns of diversions to take advantage of the time value of water is key to a solution and would be necessary to solve the Delta's problems regardless of whether water supplies are increasing, decreasing or being maintained. He added that new storage capacity would allow water to be moved to storage at times when not needed for environmental or water supply purposes and released at later times.

Lester Snow explained that the water and resource management strategy aims to achieve the proper balance between the amount and use of new storage and demand management. He explained that storage was proposed for each alternative because it would be difficult to address the fish entrainment problem without storage, storage increases flexibility for environmental flows, it reduces potential groundwater overdraft, and it reduces conflict among demands for water. He described several questions yet to be answered about the proper role of storage in a CALFED solution, including how to determine when storage should be created, how it would be financed, and how to use storage to achieve water use efficiency goals and provide access to water transfers.

Dick Daniel (CALFED Program staff) provided information on ideal water flow patterns for the Sacramento River based on water year 1995. The flows during that water year were adequate and consistent during the winter followed by two additional high flow periods in March and late April/May. He also provided examples of potential operation of storage for environmental purposes in the Sacramento River valley using data from water years 1982 through 1987 to

explain possible operation during dry and critical years. He explained that diversion to off-stream storage would be at most 5,000 cfs. Flows in the Sacramento River would have to be at least 25,000 cfs before water could be diverted to storage. He noted that water could be released from proposed storage to achieve one of the high spring flows. He added that in extended droughts when surface storage water had been drawn down, groundwater conjunctive use and transfers would be used to provide the needed environmental flows.

On the topic of demand management, Lester Snow referred to the paper in the BDAC packet detailing the results of a staff analysis of a potential large-scale agricultural land retirement effort. He noted that land retirement is not a recommended tool for water use efficiency. Land retirement is likely to occur as a result of meeting Water Quality program goals, though on a scale smaller than that analyzed in the paper. A large land retirement effort would likely cause significant impacts to a specific region and user group and thus violate the Solution Principles. He noted that further analysis would be prepared.

Discussion Points

Mr. Buck and Vice Chair McPeak commented that the key points for water year 1995 were that flow patterns and desirable temperatures were achieved. Mr. Daniel agreed. He noted that these conditions resulted from flows contributed by Sacramento River tributaries that are not impounded and were not a result of releases from Shasta Dam.

- BDAC member Pietro Parravano asked about the relationship between flows and overall low abundance of winter and spring run chinook. Mr. Daniel replied that the spring run was adapted to stay over for a year if necessary prior to migrating to the ocean. Winter run do not have this adaptation, nor do they have access to cooler waters above Shasta Dam, thus the temperature control device on Shasta Dam is operated to provide the appropriate temperatures downstream of the dam.
- In response to a question from Mr. Graff, Mr. Daniel agreed that the proposed water and storage management would undergo independent scientific review.
- Vice Chair McPeak urged staff, in CALFED documents and presentations, to specifically state the anticipated response of the ecosystem to proposed actions. She requested that work be accelerated on specific recommendations for performance standards and indicators for the estuary because such information is vital to resolving the conflicts in the Delta. She requested that a report on this topic be on the March BDAC agenda.
- Mr. Meacher asked for a rough estimate of the cost to build new storage facilities. Lester Snow replied that current estimates are \$1.5 billion. He added that there are many tools for managing water supply and that each alternative uses all the tools. In conclusion, he noted that the Program is estimating that 3.8 million acre-feet of 2020 water demand will

be met through water conservation and recycling.

- BDAC member Steve Hall commented that off-stream storage would increase the ability to operate existing on-stream storage for flood control purposes. Lester Snow agreed, yet cautioned that it is yet-to-be determined if there is an exact acre-foot match between off and on-stream storage. He added that additional storage options include the San Joaquin Valley, locations near the Delta, and in southern California, and groundwater storage around the state.

Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Buck and BDAC members Richard Izmirian and Bob Raab further discussed potential water storage. Linking storage to finance and water use efficiency is critical to increasing trust in the CALFED process and to formulating a comprehensive solution. In fact, the Program has already linked use of storage with water use efficiency measures. Sites for new storage should be environmentally acceptable and not cause redirected impacts. The linkage between storage and a possible isolated conveyance facility was not clear. Lester Snow responded that the storage decision is not fully linked with the conveyance decision.

Mr. Dunning, Mr. Hall and Mr. Izmirian recommended that further analysis on land retirement be conducted. This should include better estimates of the benefits and costs as well as more information on the impacts to communities. It should also include an estimation of the costs that are avoided due to land retirement. Lester Snow responded, in part, by stating that the staff analysis on land retirement showed a reduction in consumptive use.

- Mr. Dunning commented that the Program faces a choice between an orderly land retirement program or a chaotic approach, the latter being more injurious to communities.
- BDAC member Judith Redmond expressed several concerns regarding the land retirement analysis. It contains unrealistic job creation estimates. The potentially impacted landowners have not invested in the communities, so are unlikely to do so following retirement. The estimates of water gained are questionable, given that it is difficult to determine which crops would actually go out of production. The cost estimates were likely to be inaccurate and should be adjusted to reflect impacts on property taxes, unemployment and related social costs. She added that a land retirement program should be accompanied by a transitional relief and mitigation program. It should also be analyzed in light of the cumulative impacts from other parts of the CALFED program that may trigger land retirement. She commented that environmental benefits from farming the westside of the San Joaquin Valley do need improvement. Mr. Hildebrand concurred with Ms. Redmond's comments.
- BDAC member Marcia Sablan commented that while a smaller land retirement effort to improve water quality was expected by her constituency, an effort of this size could turn

communities such as Firebaugh into economic ghettos.

- BDAC member David Guy stated that land retirement was eliminated as a water use efficiency tool at the end of Phase I and that staff and BDAC should spend time on other efforts.
- Mr. Pyle noted his support for the staff's conclusions.
- Ms. Notthoff commented that land retirement is one of several tools for Water Use Efficiency. She noted that an inequity exists as the majority of water savings are projected to occur in the urban sector, which only uses 15 % of water supplies in the state.

Vice Chair McPeak and Mr. Hildebrand requested information on agricultural soils and on the status of agricultural land protection. Mr. Hildebrand further called for detailed information on water savings resulting from conservation and recycling. Rick Soehren (CALFED Program staff) replied that such analysis will be in the EIR/EIS appendix.

Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Buck, Mr. Dunning, Mr. Stearns and BDAC member Rosemary Kamei continued discussion on land retirement as part of the CALFED Water Use Efficiency component. It was noted that this is in part, a dialogue on how to use water in California. The Bay Area business constituency supports market mechanisms and water transfers as part of the solution. Water exports are controlled by the Bay-Delta standards so no additional Delta outflow would result from land retirement. Both land retirement and an isolated conveyance facility are controversial, yet it appears that land retirement was not being given enough attention. For the agricultural constituency in the San Joaquin Valley, the level of land retirement in the staff analysis was unacceptable. More realistic acreage estimates should be used if further analysis is necessary to comply with federal requirements. Land retired from agriculture will likely convert to another use if not specifically designated for open space and such conversion has long-range implications.

- Mr. Graff informed BDAC of a letter from Congressman Pombo's office that was critical of CALFED. Lester Snow responded that many impacts from the CALFED Program could occur in the Congressman's district. Discussions with him were underway.
- In response to a request by Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Stearns agreed to report at the March BDAC meeting on his constituency's views of land retirement.
- Ms. Davis called for information on how demand management will be used in the common programs, phasing of CALFED programs and an estimate of overall water supply.

Public Comment

- Linda Cole (Valley Water Protection Association) inquired if minimum flow regimes would likely change once the status of vulnerable species had improved. Mr. Daniel replied that the Program is trying to achieve a higher baseline for health of the ecosystem. He also noted that the Program is addressing species that are protected by the Endangered Species Act as well as improve the fundamental ecosystem processes.
- Ronnie Cohen (Natural Resources Defense Council) commented that land retirement should be considered within the context of an integrated resource approach for demand reduction. She repeated a request for an estimate of water savings from demand reduction. She noted that land retirement is less expensive than other options for water supply. A mitigation fund might address concerns about community impacts and re-investment. She cautioned against double-counting when calculating the cumulative impacts of CALFED programs.
- Ed Petry (Mendota) commented that both the development of water storage and retiring land from agricultural production were part of the solution. Supporting expansion of the food processing sector could address the socioeconomic impacts from land retirement in his locale.
- Mr. Bobker commented that the staff analysis was inadequate for meeting federal requirements. He recommended that CALFED look at the entire mix of activities rather than conducting analysis on a piecemeal basis, which results in re-directing impacts. He suggested preparing a sensitivity analysis of land retirement to determine the appropriate mix of activities. He added that there will likely be unintended impacts and that a directed land retirement program could better address those impacts.

The Chair then asked Ms. Borgonovo to report on the Environmental Water Caucus (EWC) views of the Water Use Efficiency program. She reported that the EWC approach to solving the Bay-Delta problem places priority on using natural processes and capping exports rather than constructing new facilities. The EWC is requesting an analysis of the mix of tools, including but not limited to land retirement, that can be used to reduce demand in an amount equal to that being considered for conveyance, approximately three million acre-feet. She noted that such an analysis is necessary to establish credibility for the EIR/EIS process.

4. ASSURANCES & FINANCE: MAJOR ISSUES (Mary Scoonover, Eric Hasseltine)

Following lunch, Chair Madigan postponed discussion on the Ecosystem Restoration Program to the March, 1998 BDAC meeting.

Presentation

Mary Scoonover (CALFED Program staff) summarized work-to-date by the Assurances Work Group. At the meeting she handed out summaries of her presentation to the public and BDAC. She added that a comparative study of assurance packages in other large scale water management programs was being prepared. She noted that the next meeting of the work group is scheduled for February 25, 1998.

BDAC member Eric Hasseltine reported on the work of the Finances Work Group. His presentation covered many of the same points and issues presented to BDAC at the November, 1997 meeting. He stated that the work group is attempting to develop a set of financial principles to address aspects of the financing program including cost allocation based on benefits received, sharing the burden between users and the general public, components of user charges, determination of the ability to pay, and crediting for existing and ongoing efforts.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Hildebrand expressed concern about the ability to enforce an assurances package.
- Ms. Davis commented that the assurances must address phasing of the CALFED solution to determine the sequence for addressing issues and implementing actions. She also expressed that the assurances are a vulnerable part of the Program.
- Mr. Parravano asked for a case study analysis on a project that shows beneficial effects on anadromous fish. Ms. Scoonover explained that the comparative study reviews assurances for the Chesapeake Bay, the Everglades, and the Columbia River basin programs. She noted that while these were chosen because of the complex issues and large number of stakeholders in each locality, no situation is fully comparable to the Bay-Delta Program.

Ms. Borgonovo, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Dunning, Mr. Raab, Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Strelow and BDAC member Tom Decker discussed with Ms. Scoonover possible institutional arrangements for implementing CALFED programs. The issues of how to deal with trust and the need for an interim plan were also raised. Ms. Scoonover noted that more work needed to be done on phasing of actions and that the work group has decided to recommend against a new institution that would combine implementation of the ERPP with operation of new water facilities. Discussion followed on the desirability of a single independent administrator, a steering committee comprised of stakeholders or both to oversee implementation of the ERPP. It was noted that models for enforcing timely implementation exist in federal legislation for other kinds of programs and could be considered in this context.

- With respect to the finance report, Mr. Buck asked if credit towards payment of CALFED obligations would be given to those who undertake voluntary and compatible actions. Mr. Hasseltine replied the work group had not yet come to resolution on that topic.

Public Comment

- Dante Nomellini (Central Delta Water Agency) expressed concern about the capability of assurances to protect the "common pool" concept. He distributed copies of statutes that he claimed define and describe the common pool and obligations for its continuance. He stated that the isolated conveyance facility violates the concept. He recommended that those operating the water supply system be separated from those who will regulate it.

5. ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM (Dick Daniel)

Agenda item postponed.

**6. PHASE II REPORT & MAJOR ISSUES (Lester Snow, Rick Woodard, Byron Buck)
Presentation**

Lester Snow stated that the Program has determined that water quality and diversion effects on fisheries are the most important distinguishing characteristics to use to compare the alternatives.

Rick Woodard (CALFED Program staff) informed BDAC that the most important water quality parameter is bromide concentration. He referred to the drinking water quality paper in the BDAC packet. He noted that CALFED will be convening a scientific review panel to address approaches to controlling bromides in export water supplies. A policy question that must be resolved is the significance of this water quality parameter when placed in the context of the overall CALFED solution.

Mr. Buck explained that protecting water quality, as measured by the level of bromides, was of more importance to urban water agencies, than issues of water supply. He explained that the urban water agencies had convened a scientific review panel to review scenarios and applicable technology to achieve varying levels of water disinfection while minimizing the levels of disinfection by-products. A report of the panel's findings is forthcoming. Mr. Buck introduced Doug Owen (Malcolm Pirnie, Inc.) who was a member of the review panel.

Mr. Owen explained the present status of the rule-making processes at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to address both disinfection of water supplies and the by-products of disinfection procedures. He then reviewed four different water treatment technologies, associated costs and related issues. He noted that several water supply agencies are replacing chlorine, the primary disinfecting agent, with ozone, a more thorough microbial disinfectant. Ozone, like chlorine, does produce potentially harmful by-products when used on water supplies with high levels of bromides. Mr. Buck stated that if the quality of source water for urban supplies does not dramatically increase, the agencies would likely have to increase their overall water supply demands.

The Chair called on Phil Metzger (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) to update BDAC on

the rule-making process. Mr. Metzger explained that new regulations are required by amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act passed in 1996. They will be formulated by a negotiated rule-making process. The rule-making process will have to address the range of uncertainty regarding the benefits of reducing by-products of disinfection and the cost impacts of reducing these by-products. He noted that there are numerous scenarios under consideration in addition to the ones presented by Mr. Owen. He stated that parts of the rule-making process are undefined.

Following Mr. Metzger, the Chair asked Bob Holmquist (California Department of Health Services) to report on the state's approach to the rule-making process. Mr. Holmquist explained that the state will ultimately adopt the new regulations once finalized by the EPA. He noted that it will be very challenging for water agencies using supplies from the Delta to achieve the new standards.

Discussion Points

- Vice Chair McPeak requested information for the March BDAC meeting regarding the relative health risks associated with disinfection by-products when compared to other health risks in California.
- Mr. Buck questioned whether controlling source water upstream would effectively address the bromide level problem, as upstream controls do not address the effects of seawater brought into the Delta due to tidal influence.
- Mr. Hildebrand commented that the isolated conveyance facility is not the only way to reduce bromide levels.
- Ms. Kamei asked about the timeline for implementation following the rule-making process. Mr. Metzger replied that compliance with the new standards is required within five years of adoption of the regulations.

Presentation, continued

To report on the other key distinguishing characteristic, diversion effects on fisheries, Chair Madigan called on Pete Chadwick (Member, Interagency Development Team). Mr. Chadwick reviewed the paper in the BDAC packet describing the impacts of CALFED alternatives on fishery resources. He added that more analysis using a wider range of operating criteria is needed. Additionally, CALFED will probably convene a scientific review panel on this topic.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Buck asked about the difficulty of constructing fish passage facilities to move all species around screens at points of diversions. Mr. Chadwick replied that doing so would be very difficult.

- Mr. Parravano commented that it appears that no alternative adequately addresses fish migration needs. This appears to be in conflict with an objective of CALFED to improve the present system. Mr. Chadwick replied that there are improvements and that the alternatives vary in ability to allow out-migration of salmon smolts from the San Joaquin River. He added that some use of the Delta cross-channel during downstream migration from the Sacramento River would likely continue.
- Mr. Hildebrand asked for information on fish survival for the San Joaquin River, as well as information describing management assumptions such as use of fish barriers and export pumping rates.

7. RESTORATION COORDINATION PROGRESS (Cindy Darling)

Presentation

Ms. Scoonover reminded BDAC members to declare any possible conflict-of-interest when discussing proposals to be funded through the Restoration Coordination program. Ms. Redmond, Mr. Parravano and Mr. Stearns declared possible conflicts and abstained from discussion on this item.

Cindy Darling (CALFED Program staff) reviewed material in the BDAC packet regarding the proposed funding process for 1998. She noted that since the mailing of the BDAC packet, the CALFED Policy Group had adopted a set of funding principles. As a result of those principles, an additional \$2.6 million was directed towards projects in the North Bay.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Buck asked how the recommended "Designated Action" for \$20 million for water acquisition arose. He also asked how the acquisition(s) might take place. Ms. Darling replied that the Integration Panel had identified insufficient or ill-timed water flows as a significant ecosystem stressor, but were restricted from using Proposition 204 funds for water acquisition projects. The 1998 pool of funds contains \$68 million in federal funds which can be used for water acquisition purposes. Mr. Hildebrand commented that there would be significant third party impacts with a large water acquisition effort. Mr. Meacher commented that much work was necessary before proceeding with this action.
- Mr. Pyle commented that there were several excellent proposals. He recommended that the funds be awarded to implementation projects rather than for studies, and that priority be given to funding cost-sharing partnerships. He added that land acquisition may not be cost effective. He suggested that the program seek wide public comment on the grant approval process.

8. CHAIR'S REPORT continued (Mike Madigan)

Chair Madigan requested BDAC members to contact Robin Jenkins (CALFED Program staff) if they have conflicts with the proposed 1998 meeting schedule.

Ms. Notthoff commented that the Program had made remarkable progress with the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan and suggested that the same approach be used as a model for other parts of CALFED.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Marla Miller (West Sacramento) conveyed several comments. She urged that local jurisdictions be financially responsible for upgrading water systems and that double-taxing be avoided. She stated that tangible results are needed, not simply studies. She suggested that correcting human-caused pollution, such as mercury, was also necessary. By working on these endeavors in cooperation with local officials, CALFED could build trust.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM.